

SEC. 2. MAKING DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME PERMANENT.

(a) **REPEAL OF TEMPORARY PERIOD FOR DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME.**—Section 3 of the Uniform Time Act of 1966 (15 U.S.C. 260a) is hereby repealed.

(b) **ADVANCEMENT OF STANDARD TIME.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The second sentence of subsection (a) of section 1 of the Act of March 19, 1918 (commonly known as the “Calder Act”) (15 U.S.C. 261), is amended—

(A) by striking “4 hours” and inserting “3 hours”;

(B) by striking “5 hours” and inserting “4 hours”;

(C) by striking “6 hours” and inserting “5 hours”;

(D) by striking “7 hours” and inserting “6 hours”;

(E) by striking “8 hours” and inserting “by 7 hours”;

(F) by striking “9 hours” and inserting “8 hours”;

(G) by striking “10 hours,” and inserting “9 hours”;

(H) by striking “11 hours” and inserting “10 hours”;

(I) by striking “10 hours.” and inserting “11 hours.”.

(2) **STATE EXEMPTION.**—Such section is further amended by—

(A) redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(B) inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(b) **STANDARD TIME FOR CERTAIN STATES AND AREAS.**—The standard time for a State that has exempted itself from the provisions of section 3(a) of the Uniform Time Act of 1966 (15 U.S.C. 260a(a)), as in effect on the day before November 5, 2023, pursuant to such section or an area of a State that has exempted such area from such provisions pursuant to such section shall be, as such State considers appropriate—

“(1) the standard time for such State or area, as the case may be, pursuant to subsection (a) of this section; or

“(2) the standard time for such State or area, as the case may be, pursuant to subsection (a) of this section as it was in effect on the day before November 5, 2023.”.

(3) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Such section is further amended, in the second sentence, by striking “Except as provided in section 3(a) of the Uniform Time Act of 1966 (15 U.S.C. 260a(a)), the” and inserting “Except as provided in subsection (b).”.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—This Act and the amendments made by this Act take effect on November 5, 2023.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I have nine requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today’s session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 15, 2022, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to

meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 15, 2022, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 15, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 15, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 15, 2022, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 15, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 15, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 15, 2022, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed briefing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION, CITIZENSHIP, AND BORDER SAFETY

The Subcommittee on Immigration, Citizenship, and Border Safety of the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 15, 2022, at 3 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

U.S. SUPREME COURT

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I rise again to discuss the scheme that has captured and now controls America’s Supreme Court.

If you have been following this series of speeches, you know that we have gone over the Powell memo and the plan it laid out for the corporate rightwing. We have gone over the technique of Agency capture, regulatory capture, that has been applied to the Supreme Court. We have gone over the turnstile, that big anonymous rightwing donor setup within the Federalist Society to approve Republican nominees and the dark money front groups that sped those nominees through Senate confirmation. And we have discussed how the big rightwing donor interests influence Justices while they are on the Bench, through fast lanes for dark money litigation and flotillas—flotillas—of dark money amici curiae, front group amici.

Well, if you set up a machine like that, you will pretty soon see Justices

auditioning for the role. To understand the origins of this auditioning, you need to start with a little bit of history.

It is 1990, and President George H. W. Bush needs to fill a vacancy left by the legendary Justice William Brennan. President Bush appoints a recent First Circuit nominee named David Souter, who had spent most of his career in New Hampshire State government.

At the time, Republicans thought Souter’s short time on the Federal bench was an asset. Without a long paper trail, there was less chance that Souter’s nomination would go down in flames, like Robert Bork’s had.

But Souter wasn’t the conservative the rightwing hoped for. Indeed, he could be down-right moderate. In their disappointment, they adopted a new mantra: “No More Souters.”

When rumors got around that George W. Bush might nominate his White House Counsel, Alberto Gonzales, to the Court, he was not seen as rightwing enough, and the scheme panicked and the mantra became “Al Gonzales is Spanish for ‘David Souter.’”

John Paul Stevens was another rightwing disappointment. So “No More Souters” as a mantra was joined by “No More Stevenses.”

With these disappointments, the rightwing donors and their Federalist Society accolades vowed to better groom and vet future candidates, scouring Republican nominees’ records for maximum adherence to scheme orthodoxy.

Well, once that process was up and operating, the response was predictable. Ambitious rightwing lawyers aspiring to the Federal Bench aren’t dumb. They will follow the path that guides them to their goal. So the maximum adherence auditioning began. I have described the circuit court judge who observed his colleagues taking cases and issuing rulings that seemed to have the clear intent of sending a signal. They strained to write decisions that were dressed to impress. They were, in his word, “auditioning”—auditioning for the Federalist Society gatekeepers.

So how exactly does this auditioning work? There is a recipe:

One, you have got to understand what matters to the big donors: guns, unbridled campaign spending, corporate political power, shrinking the so-called administrative state, and rightwing social issues.

Two, fly solo. It can actually help if you go it alone. Write opinions so extreme that they stand out and donors take notice.

And, three, of course, where you can, deliver the goods. If a case allows you to score a win for a big donor interest, take it.

Three Justices who knew this recipe well were the trio nominated by Donald Trump.

As a circuit court judge, Neil Gorsuch became a darling of the rightwing donor elites for his commitment